Brunts discloses a GPS navigation system that can receive a destination database of destination related information. (Abstract). The navigation system includes a navigation board 68. (Fig. 4). The navigation board 68 includes, among other elements, a navigation control microprocessor 92 coupled to a card interface 36. (Col. 10, lines 36-47 and Fig. 4). Card interface 36 accepts a memory card 120, such as a PCMCIA card, which stores a destination database containing "a plurality of destinations arranged in a menu hierarchy of categories and subcategories." (Col. 14, lines 47-50). However, Brunts does not disclose a "data carrier has stored therein a storing and/or updating instruction for storing or updating sequence control in said microprocessor" as recited in Applicant's claim 8.

The Office Action states that the memory card of Brunts corresponds to the data carrier of Applicant's claim 8 and that microprocessor 92 of Brunts, the microprocessor of Applicant's claim 8. Memory card 120 of Brunts stores a database of destination information. The database of destination information is not used for "storing and/or updating instruction for storing or updating sequence control in" microprocessor 92 as would be required to anticipate Applicant's claim 8. Because Brunts does not disclose that a "data carrier has stored therein a storing and/or updating instruction for storing or updating sequence control in said microprocessor" as recited in Applicant's claim 8, Brunts cannot anticipate Applicant's claim 8.

Claims 9-13 and 15 variously depend from Applicant's claim 8, and are, therefore, patentably distinguishable over Brunts for at least those reasons stated above with regard to Applicant's claim 8.

Brunts does not anticipate Applicant's claim 14 because Brunts does not disclose a data processor that "communicates said control unit data to said control unit via said data bus system in accordance with instructions read from said data carrier, for storing and/or updating sequence control in said data processor." As discussed above with regard to Applicant's claim 8, memory card 120 of Brunts stores a database of destination information. However, the destination information is not communicated to a control unit "in accordance with instructions read from said data carrier, for storing and/or updating sequence control in said data processor" as recited in Applicant's claim 14. Accordingly, Brunts does not anticipate Applicant's claim 14.

Brunts does not anticipate Applicant's claim 16 because Brunts does not disclose "communicating said control unit data to said control unit via said data bus". To reject Applicant's claims 16 the Office Action states that

> the bus as disclosed in the Brunts et al. system is a
> internal bus that connects all the internal components
> to the CPU and main memory of the navigation
> system. The navigation system as represented in
> figure 2 of Brunts et al. is integrated into an audio
> entertainment system. Therefore, the internal bus as
> set forth above is considered to be a high-speed data
> bus for fast transferring the data such as video data.

It appears that the Office Action is asserting that the connections between radio control receiver boards 62, GPS receiver 70 and/or display/keyboard head assembly 12B with navigation board 68 correspond to the data bus recited in Applicant's claim 16. However, Brunts does not explicitly or inherently disclose that these connections are a data bus, nor is there any disclosure of transferring "video data" as stated in the Office Action. Accordingly, it appears that the rejection of Applicant's claim 16 is based upon some type of modification to the express or inherent disclosure of Brunts, which is not proper for an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Because Brunts does not disclose a data bus, Brunts cannot disclose "communicating said control unit data to said control unit via said data bus" as recited in Applicant's claim 16.

Since Brunts does not disclose all of the elements of Applicant's claim 16, Brunts cannot anticipate Applicant's claim 16 and dependent claims 17-20.

For at least those reasons stated above it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 8-20 as being anticipated by Brunts be withdrawn.

In the fourth paragraph of the Office Action claims 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,157,725 to Becker ("Becker") and Brunts. This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Initially it is noted that the Office Action has not provided the necessary content for a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103. As set forth in M.P.E.P.

§ 706.02(j) a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 requires that an Office

Action should set forth:

> (B) the difference or differences in the claim over the
> applied reference(s),
>
> (C) the proposed modification of the applied
> reference(s) necessary to arrive at the claimed subject
> matter.

However, the rejection of Applicant's claims 21-25 merely describes the

disclosures of Becker and Brunts without identifying which elements Applicant's

claims 21-25 which are missing from Becker that are disclosed by Brunts, or

which elements of Applicant's claims 21-25 that are missing from Brunts that

are disclosed by Becker. Accordingly, the Office Action has not set forth

elements (B) and (C) as required for a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Moreover, the Office Action has not established a *prima facie* case of

obviousness with respect to the combination of Becker and Brunts. M.P.E.P. §

2141 states that

> [t]o establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three
> basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some
> suggestion or motivation, either in the references
> themselves or in the knowledge generally available to
> one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference
> or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must
> be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the
> prior art reference (or references when combined) must
> teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

The Office Action has not established at least the first and third basic

elements of a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Regarding the third basic element of a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the combination of Becker and Brunts does not disclose or suggest that "said data processor device is programmed to cause said interface device to read selected control unit data from a memory unit coupled in communication with said interface device, and to communicate said selected control unit data to said control unit via said high speed data link."

As discussed above, Brunts does not disclose a bus, and additionally, it is respectfully submitted that Brunts does not disclose a "high speed data link". Accordingly, Brunts cannot disclose or suggest that "said data processor device is programmed to cause said interface device to read selected control unit data from a memory unit coupled in communication with said interface device, and to communicate said selected control unit data to said control unit via said high speed data link" as recited in Applicant's claim 21.

Becker discloses a system and method for defining the functional scope of a sound system. In the system a control unit, input unit and display unit "are connected to one another in such a way that through the use of the display unit, operating menus required for operating the entire system can be shown in accordance with the function scope of the entire system." (Abstract). The functional scope of at least one unit can be transmitted over a bus to a control unit. (Abstract). However, Becker does not disclose or suggest that or suggest that "said data processor device is programmed to cause said interface device to read selected control unit data from a memory unit coupled in communication

with said interface device, and to communicate said selected control unit data to said control unit via said high speed data link" as recited in Applicant's claim 21.

Because Becker and Brunts each do not disclose or suggest that "said data processor device is programmed to cause said interface device to read selected control unit data from a memory unit coupled in communication with said interface device, and to communicate said selected control unit data to said control unit via said high speed data link" as recited in Applicant's claim 21, the combination cannot disclose or suggest all of the elements of Applicant's claim 21 as required to establish the third basic criteria of a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Regarding the first basic criteria of a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Office Action has not provided sufficient motivation to combine Becker and Brunts. The Office Action states that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Becker by Brunts "in order to gain advantage therefore (i.e., a user is capable of operating variety of components on-board of a motor vehicle via a user input interface)." However, Becker already provides a user input interface in the form a display unit through which "operating menus required for operating the entire system can be shown...and the operation of the system can be performed with the aid of the input unit on the basis of displays in the display unit." (Abstract). Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine Becker and Brunts in order to provide

Becker with the ability to control components using a user input interface as this function is already provided by the express disclosure of Becker.

Because the Office Action has not established at least the first and third basic elements of a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to Applicant's claim 21, the rejection of Applicant's claim 21 as being obvious in view of the combination of Becker and Brunts is improper. Similarly, the rejection of claims 22-24, which depend from claim 21, and claim 25, which depends from claim 14, is improper.

For at least those reasons stated above it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 21-25 as being obvious in view of the combination of Becker and Brunts be withdrawn.

All outstanding objection and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in immediate condition for allowance. Notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. If there are any questions regarding this response or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket # 080437.53242US).

Respectfully submitted,

March 14, 2006

Stephen W. Palan
Registration No. 43,420

CROWELL & MORING, LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844